



MEETING MINUTES

Date of Meeting: March 24, 2015

Location: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Headquarters (900 S. Fremont Ave. Alhambra, CA)

Subject: Steering Committee No. 7

Project Name: Los Angeles County Floodplain Management Plan Update

In Attendance: **Steering Committee:** John Blalock, George De La O, Okorie Ezieme (phone), Scott Gardner (phone), Frank Lopez, Lisa Naslund, Gina Natoli (attended for Mark Child), Loni Eazell, Debbie Sharpton (phone), and Hu Yi
Planning Team: Eduardo Escobar, Jeff Li, Ira Artz, Rob Flaner, Sara Townsend and Kristen Gelino
Non-voting Attendees and Coordinating Agencies: Kerjon Lee, Tom Williams, and Salomon Miranda

Not Present: Martin Araiza, Michael Hart and Kendra Pospychalla

Summary Prepared by: Kristen Gelino – 4/7/2015

Project No.: 103IS3293/T32834

Quorum – Yes or No Yes (10 voting members present)

Item	Action
------	--------

Welcome and Introductions

- Hu Yi opened the meeting and facilitated group introductions.
 - The Agenda was reviewed and no modifications were made.
 - Handouts provided included: Agenda, February Steering Committee Meeting Minutes and Draft Action Plan Handout.
 - The February Steering Committee Meeting Minutes were reviewed and approved with 8 members voting in favor and 2 abstentions.
 - Public comment was heard from Dr. Tom Williams from the Sierra Club Water Committee. He noted that he is currently serving as a steering committee member for the City of Los Angeles' Floodplain Management Plan update. Dr. Williams addressed the committee regarding the Enhanced Watershed Management Plan and the relationship between this effort and the current County and City FMP planning efforts. He also briefly discussed several bills under review at the State
-



Item	Action
Assembly, funding mechanisms, life-cycle costing approaches, and the MS4 permit.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Hu Yi thanked Dr. Williams for his comments on behalf of the steering committee.	

Risk Assessment Update

Rob Flaner provided an overview of the status of the risk assessment for the planning process. He reported that much of the assessment is complete and the planning team is now tweaking and compartmentalizing the results for presentation in the draft plan. He indicated that all the data that has been produced throughout this planning process will be handed over to the County and some baseline training on how to use it will be provided.

Rob went on to describe some pieces of the risk assessment that have not yet been completed. He noted that a decision has not yet been reached regarding the dam inundation analysis, but it seems likely that the planning team will not move forward with this part of the assessment. Rob also described the critical facilities analysis and how the data gathered for this process was used to update the default facility information that comes with the Hazus software, referred to as CDMS. A question was asked about critical facilities that may not be located in mapped flood hazard areas, but still might be at risk. Rob explained that this is a difficult item to address and that one of the recommendations of the plan will be to gather perishable data that will help close the data gap on unmapped hazard areas.

Rob also reported that additional information had been received from the plan review agency (ISO). In order to receive CRS credit for the repetitive loss area analysis, it will need to be in a separate document from the comprehensive floodplain management plan. Rob explained that this means that two separate documents would need to be produced, adopted and maintained. He indicated that the planning team is still discussing this matter and the County has not yet reached a decision on how to move forward. Rob explained that either way the plan will address repetitive loss areas, either through one document or two.

John Blalock asked a question pertaining to increases in flood exposure since the last planning effort. Rob explained that exposure



Item	Action
<p>and estimated losses have increased. Most of this is due to the fact that the last plan was only focused on repetitive loss areas. In this planning process, the risk assessment has been expanded to all mapped floodplains, so the number of structures and dollar value exposed is much greater. Additionally, Rob explained that the methods that have been employed in this plan use replacement cost based off of industry standards, rather than assessed value, in order to better align with FEMA assessments of costs to repair versus the cost to replace what was damaged.</p>	
<p><u>Public Involvement Strategy</u></p> <p>Sara Townsend provided an update on the public involvement strategy. She indicated that the fifth and final public informational open house will be held at the Lynwood library on April 2nd from 5:00 to 7:00 pm. She indicated that a flyer has been sent out to the committee and to the library and postcard invitations have been mailed to floodplain residents in the area.</p> <p>Sara then provided an update on the questionnaire. She indicated that there had been an increase in responses since the February meeting, but that we are still shy of our goal of over 100 responses. The steering committee then discussed various messaging tactics and mechanisms to try to increase participation. Several members agreed to send out information to their networks. Sara indicated that she would send along language that could be forwarded or posted as appropriate. It was determined that the questionnaire would be left open until April 15th and the results would be discussed at the next steering committee meeting.</p> <p>George De La O briefly reported on presentations he had been asked to give at several town councils. He indicated that he presented at the Antelope Town Council on March 18th and would be presenting at the Lake Los Angeles Town Council that evening. He reported that he had modified the PowerPoint presentation from the phase 1 public meetings and the information had been well received thus far.</p>	<p>Sara will provide language that can be distributed by committee members to ask for questionnaire participants.</p> <p>Steering Committee members will forward a request to take the questionnaire as appropriate.</p>
<p><u>Program for Public Information</u></p> <p>Sara provided a brief update on the Program for Public Information (PPI) portion of the planning process. She indicated that a PPI committee had been formed and that the first meeting should be scheduled shortly. Rob indicated that messaging will be a major</p>	



Item	Action
component of the PPI committee and the committee can employ lessons learned from this planning process, specifically regarding the public meeting attendance and the survey response rate.	
<u>Draft Action Plan Review</u>	
Rob introduced the Draft Action Plan handout. He indicated that the planning team has put together 39 recommended actions. He explained that they will be prioritized in part based on meeting multiple objectives that have been developed in this plan, being accomplishable in the short term, and the availability of funding. This prioritization will be high, medium, low, rather than numerical ordering. Rob noted that there are limitations in funding for actions and that there can also be a perception problem with identified actions. Rob indicated that most funding mechanisms for these types of projects have planning requirements, so the planning team needs to ensure that the County is well situated to go after any funding opportunities that arise.	
Rob indicated that this action plan is still under development and will be finalized when the draft plan is reviewed by the steering committee and ready for public comment. Rob asked that each steering committee member review the action plan and provide comments. He indicated that the planning team is particularly interested in hearing if it seems like some potential avenue for mitigation is missing. He explained that the shaded line is the action and the columns below will be filled in as we finalize the wording and lead agency for each action. Kristen Gelino indicated that the 2010 plan had a matrix identifying responsible agencies, but no lead agency was indicated. County departments should be sure to review the information and provide feedback on identifying the lead agency. When the action plan is finalized the lead or implementing agency will be listed first and be underlined. Kristen indicated that she would distribute a word version of the document for the steering committee to provide feedback via comments or tracked changes.	<p>Steering Committee members should review the action plan and provide comments to Kristen by April 24th.</p> <p>Kristen will distribute a word document version of the draft action plan.</p>
<u>Action Items for Next Meeting</u>	
The action items identified during the meeting were reviewed.	
The meeting was adjourned at 11:41 PM	



TETRA TECH

Meeting Minutes

Item	Action
------	--------

The next Steering Committee meeting is:

April 28, 2015 at 10:30 AM

**Los Angeles County Dept. of Public Works – Headquarters
(Conference Room A)**

900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803